REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated September 6, 2007, is

believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable

reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the application.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 7-9 and 12-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated

by Bannai et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0208525; hereinafter "Bannai").

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

> "A method for realizing an **end-to-end connection**
> between a client layer connected to a Resilient Packet Ring
> (RPR) network and a client layer connected to a Multi
> Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network, the method
> comprising:
> interconnecting the RPR network and the MPLS network
> through a Transparent LAN Service (TLS) layer."

Bannai discloses a network 100 which includes a ring 102 interconnecting nodes 104,

106, 108 and 110. Transparent LAN services domains, such as domains A and B exist on the

ring 102. See para. [0025]. A device of domain A may send a data packet to another device of

domain A using MPLS protocol. See para. [0030]. As illustrated in Fig. 2, a network 200

includes rings 212, 214 and 102. A TLAN services domain may be within a single ring or across

multiple rings. See para. [0034].

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of realizing an end-to-end connection

between a client layer connected to a **Resilient Packet Ring (RPR) network** and a client layer

connected to a **Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network**. Specifically, Applicant

requests that the Examiner identify where the claimed Resilient Packet Ring (RPR) network and

the claimed Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network is disclosed in the Bannai

reference. Bannai appears to at most disclose, for example, a ring 102 having domains A or B

which apply an MPLS protocol. There is no teaching or suggestion of realizing an end-to-end

connection between a client layer connected to a Resilient Packet Ring (RPR) network and a

client layer connected to a Multi Protocol Label Switching (MPLS) network, as claimed.

Further, there is no teaching or suggestion of <u>interconnecting</u> the RPR network and the

MPLS network through a Transparent LAN Service (TLS) layer. Bannai discloses that

transparent LAN services may be provided for each of the domains A and B of the ring 102.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion of <u>interconnecting</u> the RPR network and the MPLS

network through a Transparent LAN Service (TLS) layer, as claimed.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that para. [0030] of Bannai

discloses that domain A may send a data packet to another endpoint device of domain A using

MPLS protocol. However, Applicant notes that domain A is of ring 102, which the Examiner

cites for teaching the claimed RPR network. Therefore, para. [0030] of Bannai discloses the

sending of data packets within ring network 102. The Examiner refers to Fig. 2 stating that

domain A of ring network 102 can send a packet to any user in domain A which is connected to

WAN network 202 based on MPLS protocol through a TLS layer. The Examiner asserts that the

other members of domain A on the ring networks 212 and 214 can be considered part of the

MPLS network with the destination MAC address from a source in ring network 102 is not found

in an association table.

Applicant submits that ring networks 212, 214 and 102 appear to be of a same kind of

network. There is no teaching or suggestion that ring networks 212, 214 and 102 are of different

kinds of networks. Specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that one of ring networks 212,

214 and 102 is an RPR network while another one of ring networks 212, 214 and 102 is a MPLS

network. See para. [0025]. Bannai merely discloses the application of an MPLS protocol and

does not disclose and MPLS network, as claimed.

Since Bannai does not disclose the claimed RPR network and MPLS network, Bannai

does not teach or suggest interconnecting an RPR network and an MPLS network through a

Transparent LAN Service (TLS) layer.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to Fig. 4 of Bannai for disclosing the

interconnecting of an RPR network and an MPLS network through a Transparent LAN Service

(TLS) layer. Fig. 4 of Bannai discloses a node 108 of a ring 102. The node 108 includes system

controller applications 402, a control plane framework 404, line card applications 406 and ring

card applications 408. However, the node 108 is a component of the ring 102, which the

Examiner is citing for teaching the claims RPR network. As node 108 is a component of ring 102

which is being cited for teaching the claimed RPR network, Applicant submits that the node 108

cannot consequently disclose an MPLS network.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 should be deemed allowable. To the extent

independent claim 8 recites similar elements, claim 8 and its dependent claims should be deemed

allowable for at least the same reasons.

II.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by

Bannai.

Claim 3 recites:

```
"...in the direction from RPR to MPLS:

    encapsulating received client frames in TLS packets,
indicating the final destination;

    encapsulating the TLS packets in RPR packets and passing
the encapsulated TLS packets to the MPLS network;

    wherein the TLS packets become MPLS packets and travel in
the MPLS network until the final destination;

    in the direction from MPLS to RPR:

    encapsulating received client frames in MPLS packets,
indicating a Label Switched Path (LSP) that has to be followed
up to the final destination;

    switching the MPLS packets inside the MPLS network and then
passing the switched MPLS packets to the TLS network, becoming
TLS packets;

    encapsulating the TLS packets in RPR packets and wherein
the encapsulated PLS packets travel in the RPR network, until
the final destination."
```

The Examiner concedes that the elements of claim 3 are not explicitly disclosed in

Bannai, however, the Examiner asserts that Bannai provides a clear suggestion for performing

the claimed steps. As indicated above, Bannai is not at all concerned with the interconnection

between an RPR network and an MPLS network. Consequently, Bannai is not at all concerned

with the encapsulating and switching of packets from an RPR network to an MPLS network as

claimed. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, modifying Bannai to teach the claimed

elements would not be obvious to one of skill in the art.

Further, the Examiner asserts that para. [0046] of Bannai teaches the claimed elements.

However, the aspect of Bannai cited by the Examiner discloses that a TLS microcode 422 looks

up a destination MAC address of an incoming packet in an association table. If the destination

MAC address is not found in the association table, then the TLS microcode 422 appends to the

incoming packet the broadcast MAC address and the multicast MPLS label of an associated TLS

domain.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion regarding the transmission of packets in the

direction from an RPR network to and MPLS network and vice versa, let alone any discussion

regarding the encapsulation and switching of packets until reaching a final destination.

For at least the above reasons, claim 3 and dependent claim 4 should be deemed

allowable.

III.   Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that claims 5-6 and 10-11 contain allowable subject matter

and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the

base claim and any intervening claims. At the present time, Applicant has not rewritten claims 5,

6, 10 and 11 in independent form since Applicant believes claims 5, 6, 10 and 11 will be deemed

allowable, without amendment, by virtue of their dependency to claim 1 for at least the reasons

set forth above.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Ruthleen E. Uy
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 51,361
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 5, 2007